



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. None

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 741715
DALLAS TX 75374-1715

COPY MAILED

JUN 14 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Jeffrey Jovan Philyaw	:	
Application No. 09/382,372	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: August 24, 1999	:	UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.137(A)
Attorney Docket Number:	:	
PHLY-24738	:	
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS	:	
FOR MATCHING A USER'S USE	:	
PROFILE IN COMMERCE WITH A	:	
BROADCAST	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed March 14, 2007, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a)¹, to revive the above-identified application.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to submit the issue fee in a timely manner in reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due, mailed October 25, 2006, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time are permitted for transmitting issue fees². Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on

¹ A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(1);
- (3) A showing to the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition was unavoidable;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

² See MPEP §710.02(e).

January 26, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on February 27, 2007.

With the present petition, Petitioner has submitted, *inter alia*, the petition fee, the issue fee, and a statement of facts.

Petitioner has asserted that the notice was not timely received, in that it was "delivered to the wrong box by the Post Office" and as such, the forwarding of this mail "delayed receipt of the Notice of Allowance until February 19, 2007."

MPEP 711.03(c) states, *in pertinent part*:

PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT BASED ON FAILURE TO RECEIVE OFFICE ACTION

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. For example, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G. 53 (November 16, 1993).

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office

action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

Two additional procedures are available for reviving an application that has become abandoned due to a failure to reply to an Office Action: (1) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) based upon unavoidable delay; and (2) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) based on unintentional delay.

The showing in the present petition is not sufficient to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

Petitioner has set forth that the mailing was not timely received due to USPS delivery error. In order to establish that the mailing was not timely received, Petitioner will need to provide a copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been timely received and docketed.

It follows that the present petition must be **DISMISSED**.

It is noted that Petitioner has further asked that the petition fee be refunded to his Deposit Account. This request cannot be granted - the rules and statutory provisions governing the operations of the US Patent and Trademark Office require payment of a fee on filing each petition³. Payment of the \$250 petition fee is acknowledged. Moreover, it does not appear that this petition was not necessitated by any error on the part of the Office.

Any reply must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(a)". This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C 704.

The renewed petition should indicate in a prominent manner that the attorney handling this matter is Paul Shanowski, and may be submitted by mail⁴, hand-delivery⁵, or facsimile⁶. If responding by mail, Petitioner is advised not to place the undersigned's name on the envelope. Only the information that appears in the footnote should be included - adding anything else to the address will delay the delivery of the response to the undersigned.

3 35 USC §41(a)(7).

4 Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

5 Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

6 (571) 273-8300- please note this is a central facsimile number.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225⁷. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



Paul Shanowski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office

⁷ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).